



"The short space of life forbids the laying of plans requiring a long time for their accomplishment."—HORACE.



# Impossibility OF Canadian Annexation.

Compliments of  
ERASTUS WIMAN,  
314 Broadway, New York.

-19821-

Cop  
Recd

DEC

1935

# IMPOSSIBILITY OF CANADIAN ANNEXATION.

---

[From the BROOKLYN EAGLE, September 26, 1891.]

---

Mr. ERASTUS WIMAN was yesterday sought by an *Eagle* reporter at his office on Broadway, New York, for an expression of his views in relation to the question of the Annexation of Canada to the United States and the effect of the policy of Reciprocity upon the two countries, which Mr. FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN of Brooklyn recently discussed for the benefit of the readers of this paper. Mr. WIMAN said:

"I have the highest respect for Mr. Glen's ability and sincerity. I doubt if there is any man born in the United States that more thoroughly apprehends the magnitude and importance of Canada, or who is better acquainted with the institutions of that country and the advantages that would flow both to the United States and to Canada from the closest possible alliance with each other. He has had abundant opportunity, for he is one of the very few Americans who have had a seat in the Parliament of Canada, while his contact with the farmer class as a manufacturer of agricultural implements, imparted to him a knowledge of the economic conditions of that country. I very much appreciate the time and ability which he is putting into the discussion of the Canadian question, and I believe he is gaining a great deal of influence. Further, I am particularly grateful to Mr. Glen that, while we differ very acutely, he never loses opportunity

to express a kindly sentiment towards me, and especially in recognition of my efforts to enlighten the American people as to the greater half of the Continent to the North.

"But Mr. Glen utterly and completely fails to apprehend the real sentiments of the Canadian people in relation to annexation with the United States. He is a pronounced annexationist and is anxious that this country should go to any length to achieve a political union. He would thus obliterate not only the barrier that now divides the English speaking race on this Continent, but remove from this Continent the last vestige of Great-Britain's domination. This is the almost universal dream of the average American, who without much thought indulges in it, but in our time it is nothing but a dream. Because Mr. Glen in a certain sense represents a sentiment very broadly existing, it is important his views should be shown to be impossible. The advocacy of Annexation is its surest defeat, so far as Canada is concerned, and, grateful as I am for the interest Mr. Glen evokes and the kindly words he has uttered, nevertheless I believe that he is doing infinite harm in his advocacy of political union. This advocacy keeps the people apart. It is fatal to the cause of reciprocity, which would bring them together quicker than anything else for the purposes of trade, and it is trade we are after these days rather than territory.

"It is a conviction in the minds of annexationists that the surest preventative of annexation is reciprocity. The annexationist argues that to give a free and unrestricted interchange of products and manufactures would be to afford to Canada all the material advantages which she would gain by annexation. To deny her reciprocity would be to force her into annexation, if such a thing were possible, which it is not. Hence you will see that annexation and reciprocity, at any rate for the present moment, do not go hand in hand. That the advocacy of reciprocity postpones annexation is equally true.

There is no argument in Canada in favor of annexation except the material argument, and if the material argument is removed by reciprocity annexation is indefinitely postponed.

"Now, to my mind the postponement of reciprocity with Canada is the most fatal mistake the United States can make, because, strange as it may appear, it does not advance the cause of annexation in the slightest degree. On the contrary, any tendency on the part of the United States to inaugurate a policy of force, pressure, or even indifference, is just as sure to result in the continued isolation of the two people as that the sun will rise to-morrow. The people of Canada are the most independent and self-reliant in the world. They sprung from a stock of British origin of which the Cromwellian period is an illustration. They are largely the direct descendants of the United Empire Loyalists that voluntarily left the United States, and all the glories that followed a free government, for monarchy in the backwoods of Canada, and sacrificing their firesides, their fortunes and their future, relinquished the best prospects under the sun for the sake of principle. It may have been an unjustifiable sacrifice. At this late date one may wonder, and some even smile, at this rugged determination to resist rebellion, to stand by the king, and be loyal to one's convictions; but the fact, nevertheless, remains that the descendants of the men who could make such sacrifices still control the destinies of half the continent! The fact equally remains, that all the present retaliation and abnegation possible by the United States will not force this people into a political union, which nine-tenths of them have been educated to believe would be in the highest degree discreditable. Disloyalty to Great Britain, who has treated them with the greatest liberality and under whom they have the greatest liberty, is utterly unjustifiable, and to most Canadians would seem to be a crime of unpardonable character. Mr. Glen, like all other Americans, has never yet clearly apprehended the atmosphere which pervades the average Canadian home, and

the peculiar sentimentality regarding British connection which is absorbed with the mother's milk, is taught in every school, and is wafted in every breeze in Canada. If Americans only understood it better they would appreciate its virtue, and honoring a sentiment so deep seated and so altogether creditable, they would not seek to ignore or belittle it.

"Again, Mr. Glen, ignoring the British sentiment prevalent in Canada, seems to take it for granted that the French sentiment favors a political relation with the United States. He was never more mistaken, and his information and influence is most misleading on this point. The French people are, to-day, more dominated by the Roman Catholic Church than any other people in the world, and the influence of that great hierarchy in Canada is dead set against annexation. The church in Quebec is entrenched by conditions extremely favorable to its power and growth, which it is universally believed would all be changed should Quebec become a State of the Union. It cannot be conceived that the independence and privileges of the priesthood, made perpetual by the sacred treaty of Great Britain with France, would be made perpetual as a single State in a Union of commonwealths. True, it is a mistaken view to suppose that this could not be done, for any State of the Union may do as it pleases with regard to its church, its priesthood or its religious matters. There is no provision in the Federal Constitution that would interfere. But the change from existing highly favorable conditions would be viewed with apprehension, while the possibilities of the introduction of a new life, new institutions, greater intelligence and greater independence as the result of republican institutions, make it simply out of the question to believe that in the life time of any one living, the French people, while under the influence of the Church of Rome, will favor annexation to the United States.

"Of course, the Canadians can be left to their own devices, and the result will be seen in half a



century of the policy which they are now pursuing. But it is submitted that the last half century does not show any progress toward a political alliance between the two countries. Both the policies of reciprocity and of isolation have been tried without effect. It was alleged twenty-five years ago that the repeal of the reciprocity treaty would awaken the Canadian to a sense of his dependence on this country. On the contrary, notwithstanding the fact that the reciprocity treaty existing up to 1865 was abolished, mainly in the expectation that an annexation sentiment would be created thereby, there was not the slightest sign of an annexation desire. The enormous losses which followed the obliteration of the treaty were met in Canada without a whimper. The barrier has steadily ever since gone up between the two peoples. Isolation, restriction, increased debt, exodus and all other mishaps have occurred, and yet I venture to say that it would be impossible to elect a path-master, a pound keeper or a constable on the annexation platform in a half dozen constituencies to day. It would be the ruin of any politician or any political party to openly advocate annexation, and there is no more hope of this question becoming one of practical politics, by which alone it can be accomplished, than there is of a railroad to the moon. Under the circumstances is it not folly to discuss an impossible thing?

"Horace has a good motto which Mr. Glen and his fellow annexationists should learn by heart. It is in these words: 'The short space of life forbids the laying of plans requiring a long time for their accomplishment.' Possibly annexation may be accomplished within the next century, possibly it may result from pressure, perhaps eventually from the persuasiveness of a liberal commercial policy known as reciprocity, but that annexation will come in our life time by either policy is most unlikely. Think a minute of the impossibility of annexation when you realize that Canada comprises 40 per cent. of the British empire. Dalton McCarthy, one of the few independent conservative



thinkers of Canada, a most sincere and able man, says that Great Britain by the loss of Canada would become a second-rate power. To contemplate such a possibility would fill the soul of the average Briton with consternation and horror. There are those that believe that the throne of England and all her time honored institutions would totter and fall if republican institutions were to spread suddenly over nearly one-half of her territory. There are still others who believe that the peace of the world will be best maintained by having so large a portion of Great Britain's dominion on the continent of North America, exposed at all times as it is to capture by the United States. She is always on her good behavior if 40 per cent. of her empire could be conquered in a week. On the other hand the United States are equally on their good behavior if the whole northern border of 4,000 miles and all the magnificent northern lake cities are exposed to attack.

"The people who talk glibly of annexation hardly ever think how utterly inadequate are the constitutional means to achieve it. Heretofore the United States have gained territory by two means only, revolution and war in the first instance, and purchase in the second. Louisiana, Florida, and Alaska have all been purchased, and by the purchase enormous areas have been added. Texas was conquered, but neither by purchase nor by conquest can Canada be secured. War with Great Britain for the possession of Canada, would be the most disastrous event that could happen to the United States, and for which there would not be the slightest justification. As for purchase, it is not to be thought of, for Great Britain would sacrifice anything in the world but her honor, anything in the world rather than sell a foot of her territory against the wish of her people. A revolution in Canada would be a necessary antecedent to annexation, and revolution implies a political discontent, which in Canada is entirely absent. They may be politically discontent for the moment with the party in power, but the remedy of a change is in

their own hands, and the remedy will be quickly availed of when elections occur. In view of the constitutional difficulties, in the absence of political discontent, how on earth annexation is ever to be brought about in our days seems to me difficult to comprehend. Certainly its advocacy on the lines laid down by Mr. Glen, has a tendency to indefinitely postpone it.

"My position in this matter is simply this: That annexation is unnecessary, is undesirable and is impossible. It is unnecessary, because all that annexation would achieve so far as trade and commerce is concerned, would be effectually achieved by unrestricted reciprocity. A commercial union such as unrestricted reciprocity would afford, instead of a political union, is all that is needed to open up a market continental in its extent for the manufactures of this country. It equally opens up supplies of raw material more productive of prosperity in the United States than anything else just now needed. Of all things it opens up territory for the accommodation of the emigration that is pouring in upon us, and which such scenes as that at Oklahoma in the current week show there is no more room for. The 'land hunger' which these scenes indicate shows the need of wider areas, especially wheat producing territory. No one thing in all the category of events possible to happen, would be of greater advantage than to have the 1,000 miles square of wheat bearing territory in Canada to the north of Minnesota and Dakota filled with emigrants who would be ready-made customers of the United States. The United States are making boots and shoes for 100 millions of people, with less than 65 millions to wear them. Failures are frequent in the shoe business because of the overproduction. Collars and cuffs for 150 millions of people are made at Troy alone, and we have less than one-half that number to be collared and cuffed. There is not an interest in the land but needs room for expansion. The corners and combinations in oil, sugar, starch, lead and almost every department of human activity indicate that production

has already exceeded consumption, and that wider areas are absolutely necessary for commercial progress. We cannot wait for Mr. Glen's annexation. One hundred years is too long. Mr. Blaine's reciprocity schemes in the South are universally commended, because they have come in time to give the Republican party a new lease of life. But for free sugar, which Mr. Glen most ardently and ably advocated, there would be no hope in Ohio. Free sugar and other advantages have been immediate as the result of reciprocity toward the South. No such immediate results can be achieved by Mr. Glen's policy of annexation toward the North.

"In the anxious desire for Reciprocity, however, it may not be wise in the impending negotiations at Washington to yield to the blandishments of the Tory party, and be seduced into a partial measure of reciprocal trade. If the fullest advantages of a continental unity in trade are to be gained, it would be better to await the advent of the Liberal party to power, which in Canada seems now extremely probable. The latter is the party entirely friendly to the United States, and is ready to yield every point which this country can demand consistently with honor and a maintenance of British connection. Any attempt to force either party to concessions in the hope of annexation will be simply postponing the enormous advantages which to both countries would flow from an unrestricted reciprocity."

r  
l  
-  
s  
y  
o  
e.  
y  
o.  
e-  
l.  
r.  
  
r,  
s  
of  
al  
n-  
oe  
of  
na  
ty  
ly  
nd  
of  
er  
ill  
es  
re-

